

The whole suggestion of it is that great amounts of vegetation came into existence on that day.

The 8th reason which begins at the bottom of page 10 I have already quoted in full at the beginning of this letter. It is merely a statement that we should not read anything into the Scripture that is not there. There is no evidence contained under a discussion of this particular point. A statement is made at the end as to what the ancient fathers of (13 1/2) believe. I am sure (record unclear)

d.4. (1/2)

...we cannot say that Moses intended to convey the modern geological idea of aeons in each day of creation." Neither can we say that Moses intended to convey the modern astronomical idea of the time that it takes the earth to revolve once on its axis. It is clear in the Scripture that the word day as used in the Hebrew means a period of time and does not specify, and that the ~~length~~ length of the period has to be gathered from the concept. Sometimes it is an extremely short period, sometimes it is an extremely long period. Which it is in Genesis 1 the Lord has not revealed to us and we are wrong in attempting to be wise above what is written."

In the middle of page 11 we read these words:

REASON NUMBER NINE goes right to the heart of the controversy: we are in favor of the solar idea because any other idea is merely a concession to the time element demanded by the evolutionary school of geology; and why should we concede them anything from the Scripture? They are irreconcilable enemies and their program does not call for reconciliation with the Scriptures but rather eradication of the Scriptures. This theory was born to uphold the contentions of the enemies of the Bible, and we owe them no consideration in the matter."

This ~~is~~^{is} the sort of argument which, no, as far as the statements of the argument are concerned I would agree with it one hundred percent. We do not need to make any